

Applicants: Janez PIRŠ et al.  
Appl. No. 09/830,290

**REMARKS**

Applicants have carefully reviewed the contents of the Office Action mailed January 13, 2004, in which claims 18, and 22-24 were allowed and claims 13-17 and 19-21 were indicated as allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments.

By this Amendment, claims 13-15, 17, 20 and 23 are amended. Accordingly, claims 13-24 are pending in the instant application.

The Office Action objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) because the limitation that the “time integral value remains within a predetermined interval  $V_{C1}$  ‘less or equal to’ Int ‘less or equal to’  $V_{C2}$  must be shown” as explained in paragraph 2 of the Action. By the foregoing amendments to claim 13, the controlling step of the method is amended to recite that the “time integral value  $I_{nt}$  remains within a predetermined interval  $V_{C1} \leq I_{nt} \leq V_{C2}$  where  $V_{C1}$  and  $V_{C2}$  are electric potentials input to a reference input of a respective comparator”. As described on page 8, line 7-14 of the originally-filed specification, the electric driving signals ( $V_{LCD1}$  and  $V_{LCD2}$  in Fig. 4) for the LCD electrooptic switching element are controlled in such a way that the time integral of the difference of the DC voltage component of the electric driving field never exceeds the allowed value. That is, the time integral value (output signal 10 -  $I_{nt}$  of Fig. 4) is between  $V_{C1}$  and  $V_{C2}$ . This is illustrated in Fig. 3 where electric potentials  $V_{C1}$

Applicants: Janez PIŘS et al.  
Appl. No. 09/830,290

and  $V_{C2}$  are connected to respective comparators. Accordingly, it is believed that this method of controlling is illustrated in the drawings so that one of ordinary skill in the art would understand the claimed invention. Withdrawal of the drawing objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 13-17 and 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for the reasons explained at the top of page 3 of the Office Action. The foregoing amendments to the claims take into account the Examiner's comments, as well as the objections to claim 17, and it is believed that the claims are now fully definite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and no longer contain the informalities mentioned in paragraph 3 of the Action. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections in paragraph 3 and the rejection under 35 U.S. it is believed that the claims are now fully definite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the drawings, the claim objection and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and the issuance of a Notice of Allowance indicating that claims 13-24 are allowed over the prior art of record.

Applicants: Janez PIŘS et al.  
Appl. No. 09/830,290

Should the Examiner believe that a conference would advance the prosecution of this application, she is encouraged to telephone the undersigned counsel to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 8, 2004

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Catherine M. Voorhees  
Registration No. 33,074  
VENABLE LLP  
P.O. Box 34385  
Washington, D.C. 20043-9998  
Telephone: (202) 344-4000  
Telefax: (202) 344-8300

CMV/elw  
DC2DOCS1\537266